

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action January 21, 2010. Claims 1-7 are cancelled, claims 8, 10-13, 15, 17, 19, and 21-24 are amended, and new claims 29 and 29 are added¹. Claims 8-29 are now pending in view of the above amendments. Applicants note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. Applicants also note that the remarks presented herein have been made merely to clarify the claimed embodiments from elements purported by the Examiner to be taught by the cited reference. Such remarks, or a lack of remarks, are not intended to constitute, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence, on the part of the Applicants: as to the purported teachings or prior art status of the cited references; as to the characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner; or as to any other assertions, allegations or characterizations made by the Examiner at any time in this case. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of the cited references at any appropriate time. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 8-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0127432 (*Saito*). Applicants traverse at least on the grounds that *Saito* fails to disclose each and every element of the claims, as the elements are arranged in the claims.

Claim 8 as amended recites "a pre-grinding washing step for washing a surface of a polished disk-shaped glass plate with a strong acid washing liquid and then with a strong alkaline washing liquid, ... ; and thereafter a step for grinding ..." As will be explained below, at least this element is not disclosed or suggested by *Saito*.

¹ Support for the amendment and the new claims can be found at least at: page 9, lines 15-32; and page 19, lines 2-7.

In rejecting claims 8-12 and 25, the Office Action states that *Saito* discloses, on page 2:
... the washing step includes immersing the glass plate in a strong acid solution and then immersing the plate in a strong alkaline solution (¶0074).

Paragraph 0074 of *Saito* states:

[0074] A textured glass substrate produced by the same method as in Example 1 was chemically strengthened by immersing it for 90 minutes in a molten salt mixture heated at 380 degree C consisting of potassium nitrate (60% by weight) and sodium nitrate (40% by weight). After the chemical strengthening treatment, the glass substrate was immersed in 65 degree C hot water to remove the residue of the molten salts from the glass surface. The glass substrate was further immersed for 5 minutes in 3% sulfuric acid solution kept at 40 degree C while applying 48 kHz ultrasonic thereto at 1 W/cm², and was then rinsed in a pure-water bath. Subsequently, the glass substrate was immersed in an aqueous potassium hydroxide solution having a pH of 9.5 and then rinsed and dried In the same manner as in Example 1 to obtain a sample. The main surface of the sample obtained had an Ra of 1.2 nm, showing that the same satisfactory texture as in Example 1 could be obtained even through chemical strengthening. The sample was further analyzed by total-reflection fluorescent X-ray spectroscopy to determine the iron element remaining on the surface. As a result, the amount of residual iron was found to be below the detection limit (1 x 10⁸ atoms/cm²) (Emphasis added)

Paragraph 0074 of *Saito* discloses a washing step for a textured glass substrate that is produced by the same method as in Example 1 (¶0069). Thus, the washing step, is for a textured or grinding-processed glass substrate.

In contrast, claim 8 recites "a pre-grinding washing step for washing a surface of a polished disk-shaped glass plate with a strong acid washing liquid and then with a strong alkaline washing liquid, ... ; and thereafter a step for grinding" These elements, among others, distinguish claim 8 from the teachings of *Saito*.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claims. In view of

the distinction of claim 8 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in *Saito*. More specifically, a washing step for a textured or grinding-processed glass substrate, as taught in *Saito*, does not disclose "a pre-grinding washing step for washing a surface of a polished disk-shaped glass plate with a strong acid washing liquid and then with a strong alkaline washing liquid, ... ; and thereafter a step for grinding ..." as recited in claim 8. As a result, *Saito* does not anticipate claim 8.

Claim 11 includes similar features and is therefore not anticipated by *Saito*. Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-25 depend from claim 8 or 11, and so at least similarly distinguish over *Saito*. In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 8-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-25 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under § 102 is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 13, 15, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saito*.

Because claims 8 and 11 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed herein, claims 13, 15, 26 and 27 are patentable because they depend from claim 8 or 11. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 13, 15, 26 and 27 is improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

The new claims 28 and 29 depend, respectively, from claims 8 and 11 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 8 and 11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney. In view of the recent USPTO initiative regarding compact prosecution, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience in the instance that additional impediment exists to the prompt allowance of this case.

Dated May 21, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. # 45454

CARL T. REED

Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone No. 801.533.9800